

Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

NOTES ON THE DYNASTIES OF OMRI AND JEHU[1]

I. *Introduction.*

THE object of the following pages is to specify some preliminary problems which arise in studying the history of the dynasties of Omri and Jehu, and to show that there are certain internal features the explanation of which is involved with the problems which are encountered at other periods of biblical history. Consequently, these pages do not attempt to deal finally with the questions; the recognized literary structure of the historical writings of the Old Testament warns us that similar influences have been at work everywhere, and it will be safer to direct one's attention to the positive data scattered over the entire field than to strive to present elaborate or complete conclusions regarding separate groups.

For the few years from the commencement of the Syrian wars towards the close of Ahab's reign down to the accession of Jehu and Jehoash (of Judah), we have a singularly copious supply of literary material in the book of Kings, a number of noteworthy variant traditions in 2 Chronicles, and some extremely welcome external evidence in the inscriptions of Shalmaneser II. Thanks to the possession of three distinct sources, one of which is contemporary, it is possible to obtain a more complete estimate of the period, in the light of which the scantier records for the years which precede and follow may be reconsidered. While Shalmaneser's inscriptions may be coloured by the loyalty of a royal scribe, we shall do well to avoid any *a priori* ideas in regard to the relative value of the biblical sources; thus we shall avoid the initial assumption that the book of Kings is necessarily historical and that the late book of Chronicles is obviously unhistorical. The first aim will be, not the reconstruction of the true history of the period, but a consideration of the traditions that prevailed, and since the religious standpoint of Chronicles is already sufficiently recognizable it should not be difficult to determine where its evidence is most likely to be unreliable.

Thanks to the accessibility of the recent commentaries on Kings it is unnecessary to deal at any length with the general character of

[1] Based upon a paper read before the Cambridge Theological Society, February 21, 1906.

the earlier written sources.[1] We have to distinguish (1) the separate and independent annals of the two kingdoms Israel and Judah, (2) biographies and collections of narratives associated with the work of the prophets (in some cases earlier political records are implied), and (3) narratives of exclusively Judaean interest, viz. the history of Jehoash (2 Kings xi-xii). A careful examination has shown that these three sources which have been incorporated are not of the same origin, and necessarily not of equal value for the history of the period. Moreover, there are some indications of adjustment and dislocation which cannot be overlooked. For example, if Elijah is the prophet of the fall of Omri's dynasty, Elisha is certainly that of the new, and it is therefore noteworthy that the latter, in spite of the prominent part which he took in securing the rise of Jehu, disappears from the pages of history for some forty-five years until the days of Jehoahaz of Israel. But although northern tradition has carefully preserved the name of the prophet Jonah, Jeroboam's contemporary (2 Kings xiv. 25), it is to be observed that the brief notices of the disastrous wars in the dynasty of Jehu make no reference to Elisha, whereas the final interview, some forty-five years after Jehu's accession, explicitly represents the dying prophet as one "whose spirit had been the best defence of the realm—its chariots and its horsemen" (Skinner, p. 350). It is a natural inference that Elisha had been the mainstay of the land in its calamities, and it is difficult not to agree with Robertson Smith that "those narratives in which the renowned prophet appears as on friendly terms with the king and possessed of influence at court, plainly belong to the time of Jehu's dynasty, though they are related before the fall of the house of Omri[2]." Granted that this be the case, we find at the very outset the probability of a rearrangement of tradition the significance of which will have to be carefully watched. It is obvious that the feature which has been already recognized implies more than mere chronological

[1] Frequent use has been made of I. Benzinger in the *Kurzer Hand-Commentar* (1899), R. Kittel, *Handkommentar* (1900), C. F. Burney, *Notes on the Heb. Text of Kings* (1903), J. Skinner in the *Century Bible*, and C. F. Kent, *Israel's Hist. and Biogr. Narr.* (1905).

[2] So (after Kuenen) in art. "Kings," *Ency. Brit.* (ed. Kautzsch, *Ency. Bib.*, col. 2670, see Kuenen, *Einleitung*, i. 2, p. 80). See also Benzinger, p. 130; J. S. Strachan, *Hastings' D. B.*, i. p. 694; W. E. Addis, *Ency. Bib.*, col. 1276 (§ 2); G. A. Smith, *Hist. Geog. of the Holy Land*, p. 582; König and Hirsch, *Jewish Ency.*, V, 137 sq. (who remark, "legend being as indifferent to accuracy in dates as it is to definiteness of places and names"), and W. R. Harper, *Amos and Hosea*, p. xli sq. These references will sufficiently indicate the extent to which the evidence has impressed previous writers.

dislocation, but it is for literary criticism to determine what changes have ensued in the course of adjustment.

The possibility—or rather the probability of early fluctuation is confirmed by a careful investigation of the framework, the chronological data, and the LXX. Thus, in 2 Kings i. 17 sq., the synchronism is at variance with the scheme in iii. 1, and the LXX inserts at this point the introduction to Jehoram of Israel, with the addition "the anger of the Lord was kindled against the house of Ahab." This, as Dr. Skinner observes, looks very like a preface to the events in ix sq., and according to the chronological system of the LXX, Jehoram of Israel ought to follow after Jehoram of Judah (viii. 16–24). There are other intricacies in viii. 16, 25–29, and ix. 29, and a close study of the whole evidence endorses Dr. Skinner's remark (on i. 17 sq.) that the indications "go to show that the disorder in this passage is connected with sweeping operations on the text, in the course of which the independent Elisha-narratives were freely transposed in accordance with the views of different editors" (p. 276). These operations, it is to be added, belong to a relatively late stage in the literary history of the book.

Fluctuation of tradition appears also in regard to the site of Naboth's vineyard, in Ahab's penitence, the modification of the original penalty, and his death (see below, p. 604). Again, according to our records it was Elisha and not Elijah who anointed Jehu; and despite the command to Elijah to return to the wilderness of Damascus, the prophet is actually found at Abel-meholah. That is to say, instead of taking the route east of the Jordan he went straight to the middle Jordan valley[1]. Further, although Hazael, Jehu, and Elisha are spoken of as the men of the new age to be ushered in by the sword (xix. 17), the whole course of events as preserved in the present writings is entirely at variance, and unless one may suppose that a very different tradition of the age was once extant, we must allow that the passage is an unfulfilled prediction proving that it is "no invention of a late writer with an eye on the fulfilment" (Skinner, p. 241). It is very difficult to determine which is the less drastic remedy. On the one hand, a source which breaks off abruptly after ver. 18 represents situations which utterly conflict with the canonical history; on the other, writers have preserved a remarkable theophany with an unfulfilled prediction which had no value outside the period to which it is ascribed[2].

[1] See the commentaries on 1 Kings xix. 15–19.

[2] That is to say, it stands upon quite another plane as compared with ideals and hopes of the future (e.g. the return of the Ten Tribes). Another equally embarrassing prophecy will be encountered in xxii (p. 604 below).

In general, it is clearly necessary to take notice of the interests of the various sources. The independent annals of Israel and Judah have each a separate standpoint. This often obscures the relations between the two kingdoms, and it is necessary to go behind the compiler's method (that of handling the reigns separately) in order to estimate if possible existing conditions. Some allowance must also be made for the interest in the prophetical figures and its bearing upon the development of tradition. As in 1 Samuel, some growth can be traced, and it may be noticed in passing that the story of Elijah in 2 Kings i is marked by a fierce supernaturalism quite unlike other conceptions of his personality, and whatever view one may maintain, the chronological note in i. 17 is at variance with the scheme in 1 Kings xxii. 51, 2 Kings iii. 1, and the isolated allusion to the Moabite revolt in i. 1 seems to anticipate, in a rather unintelligible manner, the fuller account now given for the reign of Jehoram (iii. 4 sqq.). Finally, although it might be assumed that the lengths of the reigns of the kings are more trustworthy than the synchronisms, the 240 years of the Israelite kingdom fall naturally into three equal portions, the second of which corresponds to the duration of the Aramaean wars from a date shortly before Ahab's death to the accession of Jeroboam II. If this, together with other features, is suggestive of a certain element of artificiality, the possibility that it has influenced the traditions should not be overlooked.

II. *The Aramaean Wars.*

The inscriptions of Shalmaneser II furnish a very clear account of the steps he took to extend the supremacy of Assyria westwards [1]. As he prepared to subjugate North Syria great preparations were made by the southern states to meet the inevitable conflict. Damascus under Bir-idri (Ben-hadad) was the centre, and a coalition was formed in which Hamath, Cilicia, Phoenician towns, Ammon, and Ahab of Israel took part. In 854, at the battle of Ḳarḳar (perhaps Apamea), Shalmaneser claimed a victory over the allies, but the fact that he soon retired without imposing tribute suggests that it was by no means a decisive one. Indeed, again in 849 and 846 expeditions were sent against Bir-idri. In 842 came another great attack. Hazael (now king of Damascus) made Sanir in Lebanon his stronghold, he was forced to flee to Damascus, and the Assyrian records would show that although his country was wasted, the capital itself was not

[1] Reference may be made to L. B. Paton, *Syria and Palestine*, pp. 200 sqq.; H. Winckler, *Keilinschr. u. d. alte Test.* (3), pp. 40 sqq., 247 sqq.; C. F. Kent, *op. cit.*, p. 496 sq.

taken. It is at this juncture that Jehu together with Tyre and Sidon sent tribute. But although Hazael appears to be without the support of the coalition, and in spite of the devastation of his land, his position was not hopeless, and once again, in 839, Shalmaneser marched for the last time against the cities of Hazael, captured four of them, and received tribute from Tyre, Sidon, and Byblus.

The biblical narratives in turn furnish independent accounts of the relations between Ahab and Ben-hadad, Jehu and Hazael, and describe the part taken by Elisha in the changes which led to the accession of the latter pair. But no reference is made to Shalmaneser or to Assyria, and the feature is an instructive one for a consideration of the horizon of the writers. Now for the time of Ahab we have three prominent events: (*a*) Ben-hadad's unsuccessful siege of Samaria (1 Kings xx. 1–22); (*b*) Ahab's victory at Aphek in the following year, when cities were restored to Israel (vv. 23 sqq.); and (*c*), after a three years' peace, the war at Ramoth-Gilead when Ahab was mortally wounded (xxii)[1]. The first point that arises is the conflict between Ahab and Ben-hadad and their co-operation against Shalmaneser. Did Ahab take part in the battle of Ḳarḳar willingly or unwillingly? Was he an independent ally or a vassal? The biblical tradition of the relation between the two (see 1 Kings xx. 3 sq.) suggests the latter (cp. Skinner, p. 244); on the other hand, "it is difficult to suppose that Ben-hadad could compel the attendance of such an army as is ascribed to Ahab by the Assyrian inscription[2]."

But it is also necessary to fix the chronological order of events, and since Jehu was evidently reigning in 842 we must either place all three biblical narratives after the battle of Ḳarḳar and cut down the reigns of Ahaziah and Jehoram, or, we must conclude (with most scholars) that the first two precede, while the last follows the great battle. In fact, it is possible to place Ḳarḳar in the spring of 854 and Ahab's last fight at Ramoth-Gilead in the autumn, and this just allows the twelve years before the accession of Jehu.

Consequently, if we are to combine the Assyrian evidence with the biblical traditions[3], we must assume that Ben-hadad had attempted to coerce Ahab, but had himself suffered defeat, that they were united against Assyria (in 854), but that a few months later hostilities were resumed. The biblical tradition might imply some old feud of long standing, it is true, but it seems extremely unlikely, from what is

[1] Chap. xxi, which breaks the connexion, is placed before xx in the LXX.

[2] H. P. Smith, *O. T. Hist.*, p. 195.

[3] The source of the latter "seems to be popular history of the northern kingdom, written from a political rather than a religious standpoint" (Skinner, p. 244).

known of the period, that Ahab should have desired to provoke a conflict with the superior power of Damascus[1]. Some intelligible situation should be conceived, since on the natural interpretation of Shalmaneser's records Damascus had been making strenuous efforts to collect an army of allies, and although the records for 849 and 846 are unfortunately brief, it is quite clear that some coalition still existed at those dates. Thus when the two distinct sources are brought together a serious historical problem arises, and, so far from attempting to explain one in the light of the other, it is safer to consider them more narrowly as separate units in the first instance.

But the Aramaean wars during Jehu's dynasty form a continuous thread. From the annals of his reign we learn that "in those days Yahweh *began* to cut Israel short[2]" (2 Kings x. 32). In the time of Jehoahaz Israel was reduced to its last extremity (xiii. 3 sq. 7). Under Joash the tide turned, and the king in accordance with the words of Elisha evidently defeated Hazael's son Ben-hadad at Aphek, and succeeded in recovering the cities which Hazael had taken from Jehoahaz (xiii. 17, 25). These very brief annalistic statements stand in marked contrast to the detailed narratives of Ahab's time, and the general tenor of the latter shows that they belong to popular tradition and are not without some elements of exaggeration (1 Kings xx. 29 sq.). But those narratives appear to be of one stamp, and the climax is reached partly in the death of Ahab, the punishment for his guilt (xxii. 37 sq.), and partly (in view of his repentance, xxi. 29) in the death of Jehoram, a dozen years later, when a new dynasty began. Now, in the account of Ahab's victory at Aphek (xx. 23–34), the king of Israel who defeated a Ben-hadad is nameless[3], and when the latter agrees to restore the cities which his father had taken from the father of the former, it is a natural inference that Omri had been compelled to cede some of his territory to Damascus. No one will suppose that the reference is to Omri's predecessor Baasha, who had also suffered from a Ben-hadad (xv. 20), but, as the notice stands, it can only mean that Omri, one of the most successful of Israelite kings, in spite of his alliance with Phoenicia and his marriage-relations with Judah, was coerced in some manner by his more powerful neighbour. If, however, the supremacy of Damascus was so great, the varying relations between Ahab and Ben-hadad about the year 854 become more difficult. On the other hand, it is at least

[1] See also H. P. Smith, p. 202: "It is difficult to suppose that the campaign of Ramoth-Gilead, in which Ahab lost his life, took place the same year with the severe losses of the battle of Ḳarḳar."

[2] Or, "to be angry with" Israel (reading לְקַצֹּף).

[3] The text of verse 34 is extremely suggestive of later alteration.

a coincidence that the details of the treaty should agree so closely with the events in the time of Joash (2 Kings xiii. 25), and it is not surprising that it has been conjectured that there has been some confusion or interchange (cp. Benzinger, p. 146).

The account of the last interview between Jehoash and Elisha shows faults in the king's character; there was "a lack of grit and determination, a disposition to rest satisfied with something less than the utmost attainable" (Skinner, p. 351). The opportunity was offered to him of making an utter end of the Syrians, but he lacked energy, and the dying prophet chides him for this, and promises him only three victories over his enemy (2 Kings xiii. 14–19). This may be legend, but none the less some meaning it must have; it explains in its way the partial successes which Israel achieved[1], and subsequent references would show that despite the victories of Joash it was Jeroboam who completed the overthrow of Syria. For, a passage (now out of place) refers to the saviour who delivered Israel so that they dwelt in their tents as of old (xiii. 5)[2], and the account of Jeroboam's reign proves clearly that Israel had been grievously afflicted and almost blotted out (xiv. 26 sq.). From these notices, therefore, it is to be inferred that Israel was again plunged into the midst of disastrous troubles after the three victories at Aphek and before the extension of Israelite supremacy under Jeroboam. Conditions are implied upon which the present sources are entirely silent, and it is only by a careful comparison of all the related evidence that their significance can be adequately realized.

Now, on returning to the detailed narratives of Ahab's time we find a remarkable passage—1 Kings xx. 35-43, the general tone of which has led several critics to assign it to a relatively late period. After the unnamed king of Israel had recovered his cities, he made a treaty with Ben-hadad, and a prophet comes forward to denounce the king's leniency. He warns him that as he had freed the enemy whom Yahweh had given over to destruction, he and his people would pay the penalty that ought to have been exacted. The condemnation passed upon this king is of particular interest for the manner in which it illustrates the keen political interest of the prophetic circles. But is not this exactly the spirit which we look for after the victories of Joash? The three defeats of Syria—and no more—the subsequent misery of Israel, the final conquests of Jeroboam, presuppose some cessation of hostility of which Syria subsequently took advantage,

[1] The stronger position of the land is shown also by the defeat of Amaziah of Judah.

[2] That xiii. 5 refers to Jeroboam and not to the advance of Assyria (Winckler, Kent) is almost certain.

and in Joash's day it would require no very great foresight to warn the king that if Assyria could not overthrow Damascus his few victories would not have permanent results.

Moreover, the actual course of events in Jehu's dynasty can at least be *illustrated* by observing the sequel in the narratives of Ahab. Three years later comes the account of the alliance of Ahab and Jehoshaphat against the Syrians at Ramoth-Gilead (xxii). Again the interest lies in the prophets, and the chapter with its conception of the origin of false prophecy does not appear to be from an early source (cp. Ezek. xiv. 9). Here the prophet Micaiah foresees that Israel will be scattered upon the mountains as sheep that have no shepherd (ver. 17), and the Syrians will overrun the land so that a man would flee into an inner chamber to hide himself (ver. 25). The essential purpose of the narrative assuredly proves that we are not dealing with unfulfilled prophecy, and consequently, apart from the problem of finding a place for this chapter anywhere near the date of the battle of Ḳarḳar, it is submitted that it represents historical circumstances which cannot be found in the present history of Ahab or his successors. On the other hand, is not this the situation which is elsewhere implied in the rise of Jeroboam?

Not only is there no true sequel to the representation in Micaiah's prophecy, but the fate of Ahab finds a close parallel in the death of Jehoram. In 1 Kings xxii war has suddenly broken out, Jehoshaphat and Ahab are allied, the army is at Ramoth-Gilead, Ahab is wounded and dies at *Samaria*. A few years later, Ahaziah of Judah in his brief reign assists Jehoram against Hazael at Ramoth-Gilead, Jehoram is wounded, and is killed at *Jezreel*. Apart from the similarity in these situations, the final scenes—Samaria and Jezreel, each connected with a divine denunciation—are not without some significance, and while 1 Kings xxii prepares us for conditions upon which the subsequent narratives are contradictory, the war in 2 Kings ix sq. appears suddenly without any proper introduction and must be viewed in the light of the Assyrian evidence for 842[1].

[1] The reference in 2 Kings ix. 25 sq. is to the field of Naboth the Jezreelite, the massacre of his family, and the oracle of Yahweh. It presupposes the incident in 1 Kings xxi, but not in the form in which it now appears. In the latter, Naboth has a vineyard hard by the king's palace in Samaria, and no mention is made of the death of his sons. On the one hand, Ahab shows unfeigned penitence at the murder, rends his clothes and puts on sackcloth at the news (1 Kings xxi. 16 and 27 in LXX), and the penalty falls upon his seed (vv. 27–29), i.e. Jehoram. But, on the other, Ahab actually dies at Samaria according to Yahweh's word (xxii. 37 sq.; see xxi. 19). It is not easy to determine the true relation between the conflicting passages.

The tradition which associates the activity of Elisha with the accession of Hazael points to some close bond between Israel and Syria. The prophet's visit to Damascus and the courteously framed inquiry from "thy son Ben-hadad" (2 Kings viii. 9) by no means presuppose a state of hostility. If it is difficult to explain Elisha's relations to Hazael and Jehu in connexion with the war at Ramoth-Gilead, it is still more noteworthy that he only *foresees* the horrors which Hazael would perpetrate, and the latter's incredulity hardly accords with other traditions which imply war in 854–842. It is true that some of the biblical narratives represent war with Syria between these dates, but if there are contradictory representations it would be unsound to attempt any premature reconciliation or compromise. Since in Shalmaneser's inscription Hazael appears to be isolated, since Jehu pays tribute to Assyria, and the biblical traditions depict war at Ramoth-Gilead, the view has found favour that Hazael attacked Israel in order to avenge the latter's withdrawal from the coalition, and that Jehu wished to have his independence recognized or supported by Shalmaneser. But the *argumentum e silentio* is a dangerous weapon, and the mere failure to record any allies of Hazael in 842 and 839 should not be pressed too far. The cuneiform data are quite straightforward: a coalition in 854, 849, and 846, the defeat of Hazael (alone) in 842 with the devastation of his land, and a final war in 839 when Hazael was clearly able to hold his own. If, as is generally allowed, his stronghold Sanir in Lebanon may be identified with Senir of Hermon (Deut. iii. 9), the chances are that he was still supported by his southern neighbours; and since Shalmaneser set up his monument on the headland of Baal-raš (Nahr el-kelb) and received tribute from Tyre, Sidon, and Jehu, it is equally plausible (from the Assyrian evidence alone) to assume that Jehu wished to purchase immunity. Indeed, the details suggest (by themselves) some coalition in north Palestine, and Shalmaneser's campaign in Hauran shows how nearly Israel was endangered. Moreover, Hazael's losses are put at 6,000 soldiers, 1,121 chariots and 470 horsemen (so in 842); but nevertheless three years later he was able to maintain his position and only lost four cities, while at the previous battle of Ḳarḳar his forces had amounted to 20,000 men and 1,200 chariots. It seems probable, therefore, that Hazael was not entirely bereft of support, and it is evident from later events that Damascus and Ammon (at least) were natural allies (Amos i. 13 sq., cp. 3 sq.).

There is nothing in the independent Assyrian evidence to show that there was war between Israel and Syria in the middle of the ninth century (854–842 B.C.), or that Hazael found it necessary to

take vengeance upon a defaulting state. Indeed if the latter were the case it would be necessary to infer that Hazael would have his hands pretty full in dealing with other members of the former confederation. But, on the other hand, there is much in the external source which seems to preclude hostile relations between Ahab and Ben-hadad, between Jehoram and Hazael. When, however, we turn to the biblical evidence it is at once necessary to observe that, as Cheyne has pointed out, the fact that Ahab was once actually besieged in his own capital cannot have stood alone (*Ency. Bib.*, col. 92). Consequently, the entire situation cannot be treated as an isolated occurrence. Besides, from 1 Kings xxii we are entitled to expect after Ahab's death conditions which shall justify Micaiah's prophecy, but there is nothing to suggest that it was fulfilled, and it is equally difficult to find the prelude to the state of affairs some years later when Jehoram was wounded at Ramoth-Gilead.

Of the popular narratives which intervene, some are quite devoid of any historical background, while others either do not presuppose any state of warfare or (like the interview between Elisha and Hazael) treat the Aramaean wars as an event of the future. The story of Naaman with the account of Gehazi's leprosy (2 Kings v) does not come from the same source as the incident arising out of the seven years' famine where Gehazi is at the king's court (viii. 1–6); the latter is connected with the account of the woman of Shunem (iv. 8–37), north of Jezreel, and neither knows of any period of hostility. In v. 7, however, it is natural to see some allusion to uncertain relations between Israel and Syria (cp. 1 Kings xx. 7) and ver. 2 explicitly refers to Syrian marauding bands. Kent frankly observes "as in the case of most of these popular stories it is impossible to determine under whose reigns the events took place" (p. 232). Elisha is a prophet of renown, Israel stands in fear of Syria (ver. 7, see Kittel, *ad loc.*), and logically the narrative follows the seven years' famine (i. e. before Gehazi was smitten with leprosy). But there is no decisive date-criterion, and if the object of ver. 2 is to explain how an Israelite maiden came to be in Syria, it is evident that at certain periods of close intercourse another explanation would be equally suitable; ver. 2 may have arisen in connexion with the raids mentioned in vi. 23.

Again, in vi. 8–23, another passage where the Israelite king is unnamed, we have "a popular tale intended to illustrate Elisha's miraculous power; details . . . are conspicuously lacking" (Kent). It ends with the cessation of the raids and should thus logically precede chap. v. (Kittel); but it is generally agreed that it has no historical value, and it is merely one of the traditions encircling the majestic prophet which enable us to understand why Elisha was

regarded as "the chariots and horsemen of Israel." This is followed immediately by a more detailed account of the siege and deliverance of Samaria (vi. 24–vii. 20). It is a time of famine, for which Elisha is held responsible, and since Gehazi still holds a favoured position (as in viii. 1–6), it should precede the story of Naaman. The political background is more distinct but the data are such that a decisive opinion is at first difficult. It is obvious from its position that the narrative is ascribed to the reign of Jehoram, although its connexion with other passages where Elisha is the prominent prophet high in favour would plead for the dynasty of Jehu. Thus Kuenen ascribed it to the time of Jehoahaz, when Israel reached the bed-rock of humiliation. On the other hand, literary and other features tend to link it with stories of Ahab and Elijah, in particular with the story of the relief of Samaria in 1 Kings xx. 1–22. In both, the city suffers all the miseries of a siege, in both the prophet or man of God intervenes. The problem is a complicated one, because (1) the accounts of Ahab's wars presuppose far more than the narratives themselves describe; (2) if there was another siege in the days of Jehoram one would be led to ascribe to the same reign such passages as 2 Kings v and vi. 8-23; and finally, (3) the Israelite annals specifically represent serious conflicts in the following dynasty.

The fact that the unnamed king of Israel is called "son of a murderer" is indecisive (vi. 32 sq.). It describes the king's hostile menace, and while it is very improbable that Elisha would use this language of the dynasty which he supported, it is equally unlikely that the attitude of the sovereign would be that taken by Jehoahaz or Joash. The natural assumption is that we are in the dynasty of Omri, and one may compare Elisha's hostility to Jehoram in iii. 13 sq. This, however, will be a strong argument in favour of the view that elsewhere, where the unnamed king and prophet are on friendly terms, another historical background is to be sought. But the result is singularly embarrassing, since if we accept the logical order of the narratives, 2 Kings iii and vi. 24–vii will belong to the dynasty of Omri while – if the famine in vi. 25 is identified with that in viii. 1–3 — viii. 1–6, vi. 1–23 and v will fall under Jehu or his successors[1]. On the other hand, the words in vi. 31 sqq., which some scholars consider to be decisive for the time of Jehoram, belong to a passage where there are clear signs that the text has been manipulated[2], and

[1] The apparent logical order of the series is: iv. 8–37 (woman of Shunem), vi. 24–vii (war and the famine), viii. 1–6 (after the famine), vi. 8–23 (Syrian raids), and v (Naaman and Gehazi's leprosy).

[2] This is shown by vi. 33 (end) and vii. 2, which presuppose the arrival of the king, and by verse 32.

it would be reasonable to suppose that a later writer has put into Elisha's mouth sentiments in agreement with the condemnation passed by Hosea upon Jehu's bloodshed (i. 4) or that the transference of the narrative (*ex hypoth.*) from Jehu's dynasty to that of Ahab has led to editorial adjustment. At all events, the passage affords no criterion and in dealing with a semi-political story of this kind it is impossible to say what changes may have taken place.

Kent urges the very plausible view that "tradition has combined the popular version of the famine in the days of Elijah (1 Kings xvii) with that of the defeat of the Aramaeans in the days of Ahab (1 Kings xx), and associated both with Elisha" (p. 237). Further support for an historical background in Ahab's time is claimed in the allusion to the "kings of the Hittites and the kings of the Egyptians" (vii. 6), since the latter are doubtless the people of Muṣri who actually took part in the North Syrian confederation of 854. If Damascus had any reason to fear that Israel had hired them we can obtain a definite starting-point, and several scholars agree that this can only be before the battle of Ḳarḳar[1]. But it would be just as plausible to look for this at a later period. The confederation certainly hung together from 854 to 846, and it is very unnatural to suppose that in the years preceding there was such lack of cohesion as the above conclusion implies. From the year of his accession Shalmaneser had been steadily extending his power over the west, and in 859 he subdued the "Hittite" states of Northern Syria (Carchemish, Sam'al, Gurgum). Not until this was accomplished did he advance southwards upon Damascus, and it is safe to conclude that during these years negotiations were being made to secure the support of the states from Arabia to Cilicia[2]. On the other hand, we do know that sooner or later Damascus did not have everything its own way, and although it is unsafe to rely upon the absence of details in the records for 842, it is evident that the rise of Jeroboam in itself presupposes some subsequent weakening of the state[3]. Consequently, the external evidence

[1] Cp. Cheyne, *Ency. Bib.*, col. 2350, also col. 92; see also Benzinger, p. 142.

[2] Cp. Paton, p. 207.

[3] Since this was written, H. Pognon has published a very interesting Aramaic inscription relating to the defeat of Bar-hadad, son of Hazael, and king of Aram, by Z-k-r, king of Hamath and La'ash. Bar-hadad has the support of Gurgum, Sam'al, and other states, thus showing how small coalitions could be readily formed, and how improbable is the view that Damascus was quite isolated in 842. This valuable text, a preliminary account of which was given in the *Revue Biblique*, 1907, pp. 556 sq., is now edited fully in the second volume of Pognon's *Inscriptions Sémitiques*.

scarcely favours the probability of alliance against Damascus, at least before 846, and in all probability a lower date is to be sought.

Perhaps it will now be apparent that although almost any historical theory could be built upon a generous treatment of the various sources and a one-sided selection of the evidence, a more searching examination of the records is inevitable. The history of the Aramaean wars, which extend over one-third of the traditional duration of the northern kingdom, and begin with the dynasty of Omri, is bound up with complicated questions which must be considered separately and in their mutual bearing. (*a*) The wars at the close of Ahab's reign now form a closely connected whole, they imply far more than is actually stated, and they conclude with the expectation that Israel would be scattered without a leader, and its nobles would be forced to hide themselves from the invaders (1 Kings xx, xxii). We certainly do find within the next few years (in *some* traditions), raiding bands of Syrians, the supernatural defeat of Syrian armies, the presence of the enemy in the very heart of the land and the deliverance of Samaria (2 Kings v, vi. 8–vii). But these are disjointed, and there is no prelude to the battle at Ramoth-Gilead when Jehoram was wounded and the occasion was seized for the accession of Jehu (ix). Moreover (*b*), with Jehu's rise we find only the extermination of the Baal-cult and its supporters in the family of Ahab, and we reach the climax of the prophet's condemnation of Ahab and his successors. It is in Jehu's reign that Yahweh *began* to cut short (or be angry with) Israel, and some brief notices enable us to follow the course of events to the rise of Jeroboam. But (*c*) it is here that Elisha, some five and forty years after the accession of Jehu, is found to have been Israel's "chariots and horsemen"; it is he who had prevision of the miseries which Israel would suffer, and when tradition gives him a share in the accession of both Jehu and Hazael, it actually represents friendly relations between the two countries and depicts Ben-hadad's courteous regard for the Samarian prophet. The conflicting situations cannot be commingled. If Elisha's work fell under the dynasty of Jehu, less confidence can be placed in evidence which now fills the gap between the Syrian wars at the death of Ahab and of Jehoram. Some consistently critical attitude must be maintained throughout. Further (*d*), notwithstanding Micaiah's prophecy, Ahab is at once succeeded by Ahaziah who reigns quietly in Samaria and dies of an accident. Moab rebels against Jehoram and an unsuccessful attempt is made to suppress it. The annals of Jehoram even regard him with some favour as a reforming king. While it is to the annals again that we owe our knowledge of the (later) Aramaean wars, the popular narratives relegated to the earlier period

are marked by several peculiarities, of which the frequent omission of the name of the Israelite king is the most significant. Finally (*e*) it is necessary to consider the close resemblance between the course of events in Ahab's day and the history preceding the rise of Jeroboam II. It is well known that history is constantly repeating itself and it is naturally conceivable that tradition could have confused Aramaean wars under Ahab with those of the following dynasty. But on the traditional view these wars lasted practically without intermission for seventy years, and one would not expect the coincidences to be methodical or orderly[1]. It would perhaps be difficult to come to any decision were it not for the external evidence, and the attempt has been made to show that in so far as this appears to support the general traditional outline, this has only been effected by ignoring all the conflicting traditions. Viewed by itself, the inscription of Shalmaneser does not lend its support to any war between Syria and Omri's dynasty; indeed it brings manifold difficulties, and the position which is here adopted is that the biblical evidence cannot be reconciled in any natural manner with what is known from contemporary sources of the history of the middle of the ninth century.

The resemblance between the abruptly introduced series under Ahab, and that which "began" in Jehu's day ceases with the death of Ahab which finds an historical doublet in the death of Jehoram. In each case it is not history which is the controlling factor but prophecy, and to the interest taken in the work of the prophets much of the confusion in our narratives is due. The fluctuation in the traditions of Naboth's vineyard is more significant than appears on the surface. The murder of Naboth the Jezreelite, Elijah's denunciation, Ahab's penitence—these lead to the fate which befell Jehoram at Jezreel (2 Kings ix); it is a modification of this when the penalty

[1] Viz. Ahab's victory at Aphek, followed by the treaty, the popular resentment and warning, the final catastrophe. It will be noticed also that the first great king of Israel was denounced for his clemency to the enemy whom Yahweh had marked out for extermination (the Amalekites, 1 Sam. xv). This is regarded as the explanation of the Israelite disaster in the north, when the enemy occupy the land and the people flee in haste across the Jordan (1 Sam. xxviii. 18 sq., 2 Sam. ii. 8 sq., iv. 4). Israelite tradition was familiar with the state of extremity when the land was "like the dust in threshing" (2 Kings xiii. 7), when arms were lacking, and life and trade were endangered by an enemy who was ultimately overwhelmed in the plains of Jezreel (Judges v). It is at such a time, too, that Israel's heroic figures come to the front (cp. 1 Sam. xiii. 19 sqq.). For historical criticism it is very important to notice carefully *all* the traditions of conflicts in N. Palestine; see p. 626.

falls upon Ahab himself, and his death in Samaria agrees with the location of Naboth's vineyard by the royal palace in Samaria. To some critics 2 Kings ix appears to be a relatively more historical record than the popular narratives with which we have been dealing. Some explanation for the fluctuation of tradition is necessary, and while the death of Jehoram is followed by an account of the manner in which Jehu came to the throne, the anticipation of the penalty for the murder of Naboth has a twofold result: (1) Ahab's death is on the occasion of a similar historical background, and (2) the doctrine of individual responsibility is more implicitly emphasized[1].

III. *Judah and Israel.*

Putting on one side for a moment the arguments which have been adduced in the preceding section, we turn now to a consideration of the trend of the history of Judah as it is represented in our sources. Asa, king of Judah, son or grandson of Rehoboam, may probably be regarded as contemporary with the fall of the dynasty of Jeroboam I, the rise and fall of that of Baasha, the civil war at the accession of Omri, and the extension of Israelite power under that monarch. He was succeeded by Jehoshaphat, the contemporary of Ahab, and the close relation between the two states is evident from their joint participation in war, and from the marriage of Jehoshaphat's son Jehoram with Athaliah the daughter of Ahab. However these relations may have been inaugurated, there can be little doubt that the southern kingdom was affected by the religious innovations which marked Ahab's marriage with Jezebel, and there is no support for the assumption that the presence of the temple of Jerusalem ensured religious conditions in Judah much superior to those in the north[2]. Jehoshaphat, for example, passed for a king of indubitable orthodoxy, but this favourable judgment must be carefully weighed in view of the opinions held regarding his successors or even his kinsman Ahab.

Little is related of Ahab's successor Ahaziah apart from the revolt of Moab and the story of the king's sickness in 2 Kings i (see above, p. 600). He was followed after a brief reign by Jehoram his son—more probably his brother (so Lucian's recension)—and the persistence of the close union between north and south may be naturally inferred. In fact, Jehoram and Jehoshaphat are found in alliance against Moab (2 Kings

[1] It is well known that different representations of Ahab's character are given in the narratives. His name became a by-word for wickedness and religious institutions opposed to purer conceptions of Yahweh (Mic. vi. 16, 2 Kings xxi. 3).

[2] Cp. W. R. Smith, *Prophets of Israel* (2), pp. 111 sq., 199.

iii). Jehoshaphat, however, was apparently soon succeeded by his son Jehoram, with the result that the two kingdoms were now ruled by kinsmen of identical name. But after serious troubles in Judah, Jehoram was followed by Ahaziah, whose reign was as brief as that of his namesake in Israel. Like Jehoshaphat, he took part with Israel in the Aramaean war at Ramoth-Gilead, and on his return he fell in the massacre of the royal families of Judah and Israel by which the dynasty of Jehu was inaugurated.

No one can doubt that the history represents Israel and Judah as united by the closest bonds, and the evidence has not unnaturally led to the belief that during these few years Judah was practically the vassal of Israel. Certainly, the two were united in policy and cult, and the revolt which was aimed against the Baal-cult and its patrons and led to Jehu's accession must have concerned both Judah and Israel. The Israelite dynasty was exterminated, Ahab's seventy sons were slain, and the Judaean royal house was equally unfortunate[1]. The king of Judah fled from *Jezreel*, but died at Megiddo (ix. 27); according to another account he was found in hiding at *Samaria* (2 Chron. xxii. 9). The chronicler's tradition is not dependent upon 2 Kings; so far from being a hasty and not quite accurate summary of the earlier source, a careful comparison suggests the use of an originally independent authority[2]. This feature is of considerable importance for the historical criticism of the period. Moreover, forty-two of the Judaean royal family were slain by Jehu between Jezreel and Samaria (2 Kings x. 12–14); perhaps, if we may accept 2 Chron. xxii. 8, in company with sundry Judaean nobles[3]. On the other hand, the Judaean narrative relates that when Athaliah, the half-Phoenician wife of Ahaziah, saw that her son was dead, she slew all the males of the royal house, and that the infant Jehoash alone escaped (xi. 1). It is unnecessary to lay any weight upon the chronicler's tradition of the disasters which had overtaken the

[1] Ahab's sons were slain in *Samaria* (2 Kings x. 1), and brought to *Jezreel* (ver. 7), where all that remained of Ahab's house fell together with his kinsmen and priests (ver. 11). Jonadab then accompanied Jehu to *Samaria* for the extermination of all that remained to Ahab (ver. 17), and for the slaughter of the priests of Baal. It seems highly probable that there is some fusion of tradition identical with that which has been already noticed (p. 604).

[2] See Benzinger, *Chron.*, p. 110 sq.; Kittel, *Chron.*, p. 145.

[3] Literary criticism finds a difficulty in the present position of 2 Kings x. 12–14 which implies that the princes were fleeing *northwards*. For historical criticism, however, it is indisputable that a massacre of the Judaean royal family by Jehu was current in tradition.

Judaean dynasty scarcely a year or two previously (2 Chron. xxi. 17, xxii. 1): there is sufficient ground for the conclusion that the situation at the rise of Jehu was equally serious in Judah and Israel, and it will probably be allowed that the chronicler has hit off the situation in his statement that "the house of Ahaziah had no power to hold the kingdom" (xxii. 9)[1].

The various sources have thus brought the history of the two kingdoms to a well-marked stage. Jehu's accession was the victory of the reforming party, and it can scarcely be denied that Judah stood in need of religious reforms as surely as its more powerful neighbour (cp. 2 Chron. xxi. 6–13, xxii. 3). Israel and Judah were intimately joined by common blood and history and by the absence of definite geographical frontiers. Some of the prophetical guilds lay hard by Judaean territory, and the Rechabite supporter of Jehu belonged to a clan related to the Kenites and therefore of Judaean or southern ancestry. Moreover, intercourse between the two states, obvious enough in itself in times of alliance, is confirmed by the stories of the period. Consequently, it is on *a priori* grounds hardly likely that the reforms under Jehu were confined to Israel, and a Judaean source is obviously in harmony with the situation when it states that the people of the land destroyed the temple of Baal, broke up its altars and images, and slew the priest (2 Kings xi. 18). That is to say, if we consider the broad outlines of the period, the relations between north and south, the prevalence of the Baal-cult in both, the disasters which befell the two dynasties, and the reforms which mark the climax of the preceding years, we can gain a fair picture of the general situation which should enable us to apprehend the events which ensued. And here we are at once confronted with what I venture to think is an irresistible conclusion: Jehu, the nominee of the conquering party, would claim to be king of Judah even if popular opinion would not naturally regard him as such.

This conclusion, however, is admittedly contradicted by other evidence, and the ordinary plain historical continuity is found to be at direct variance with another source. Down to 2 Kings ix-x the history has favoured the expectation that the king who overthrew both dynasties would lay claim to both Judah and Israel, whereas in xi sq. a novel source gives an independent account of the fate

[1] Our survey of the main outlines does not require any critical study of the traditions relating to the Judaean massacres, but it may be observed that the intimate relationship between Jehoram and Ahaziah makes it unlikely that a careful distinction between Judaean and Israelite princes or nobles was regularly maintained.

of the Judaean royal family, depicts another background and furnishes another representation of the events. Athaliah, it is said, maintained herself upon the throne after the death of her mother Jezebel, and perished in a conspiracy no less than six years later; and this interval separates the reform in Judah from the parallel movement in Israel. We have already seen that there is a difference in the treatment of Israelite history before and after Jehu; here, too, we find that the compiler has utilized another record, and no light is thrown upon the relations which had hitherto subsisted between north and south. It is surely difficult to see how the daughter of Jezebel could have succeeded in maintaining her independent position. Judah was necessarily in a weakened condition, if only on account of the Edomite revolt (2 Kings viii. 22), and the suggestion that Athaliah had the support of the Judaean army would presuppose situations which must be judged in the light of the previous participation of Judaean and Israelite armies in warfare. It is necessary to visualize the situation with the help of all that can be gathered of revolts and internal disturbances in other periods of biblical history. The revolt of Edom, for example, carries with it much more than appears on the surface; the massacre of royal families must have profoundly struck the army and priesthood. It is easy to register the supposition that Athaliah hoped to take vengeance upon Jehu, but the question inevitably rises: How was this to be effected? To suggest that she relied upon Phoenician help scarcely solves the problem, since one does not know what part Phoenicia took after the murder of Jezebel, the daughter of the priest-king of Sidon. The attitude of Jehu and Israel must excite speculation, but the Judaean source is occupied with the history of Jehoash and his work upon the temple. No doubt it is a plausible suggestion that Jehu was fully occupied with the Aramaean wars (Winckler), but the independent study of the latter has rendered it doubtful whether implicit reliance can be placed upon the view that they began so early. Besides, during the minority of Jehoash the power lay in the hands of the priest Jehoiada, and it is clearly important to form some opinion of the relations between the reforming priests of Jerusalem and the prophetical party under Elisha in Israel.

About fifty years later, Amaziah of Judah came into conflict with Joash of Israel; Amaziah was captured, Jerusalem was occupied, its northern walls demolished, the temple and palace sacked, and hostages removed to Samaria (2 Kings xiv. 13 sq.). If we consider deliberately the significance of this brief notice and attempt to form some idea of all that it entails, it is impossible to convince oneself that this was merely the outcome of a mere vaunting

challenge (xiv. 8 sqq.)[1]. Historical inquiry cannot be in direct proportion to the quantity of its evidence, yet it is singular to observe the inadequate attention often bestowed upon brief significant notices of this nature. We have here remarkable light upon the political situation; it is the first positive piece of information since the death of Jehoram, and it is sufficient to show that *after* the period of union between Israel and Judah in the Omri dynasty, and *before* this disastrous catastrophe in Judah, important developments are to be inferred upon which our narratives are silent. Thus the problem is the determination of the antecedent events, the recovery of historical situations which for some reason or other have been passed over, and it is necessary to examine more closely such narratives of Judaean history as have been allowed to survive.

The account of Jehoash in 2 Kings xi. 4–xii. 16 appears in 2 Chron. xxiii. 1–xxiv. 14 in a form which is peculiarly characteristic of the later treatment of records. But even the former shows marks of a late hand, and there is reason to suppose that xi. 10 owes its introduction to the notice in 2 Chron. xxiii. 9. It may, however, be preferable to assume a common source for these verses, and the view that the chronicler has not simply re-written the record preserved in Kings, but has relied upon a parallel record, is suggested by the additional details of Jehoiada in 2 Chron. xxiv. 3. Further, that the chronicler had access to some independent tradition is demonstrated by the circumstance that 2 Kings xii. 17 sq. is replaced by a novel account of the Aramaean invasion (2 Chron. xxiv. 23 sq.), and that it is preceded by a story of Jehoash's iniquity, which surely attests some earlier source. After the death of Jehoiada it is said that the princes of Judah came and did obeisance to the king, and he hearkened unto them; they turned aside from Yahweh, and wrath came upon Judah and Jerusalem for their guilt; prophets were sent to bring them back, but they would not give ear; when at length the priest Zechariah solemnly denounced the king, the people conspired against him and stoned him to death. The sequel is found in the invasion of the Aramaeans, when a small force overwhelmed the land—the chronicler not unnaturally regards this as the penalty for the apostasy of Judah. But obviously neither the chronicler nor his age would invent both the cause and the effect, and whether he framed the apostasy to account for the invasion or endeavoured to find a necessary punishment for the king's iniquity, the fact remains that he did not utilize the account of

[1] There is a curious allusion to an attack upon the cities from Samaria unto Beth-horon in 2 Chron. xxv. 13.

Hazael's march upon Jerusalem (2 Kings). It is true that the book of Chronicles will endeavour to explain the cause of the misfortunes of monarchs, but the tradition which he has to explain is not that in the book of Kings; it is also true that their sins receive a befitting penalty, but again, it is not the earlier work which supplies the text.

Consequently, one may infer that the chronicler's records do not preserve purely arbitrary or worthless traditions, although it must be freely admitted that any attempt to recover their original value must be hazardous. It is significant, however, that the details suggest some reaction after the death of Jehoiada; some serious conflict in which the nobles and the king made common cause against the priests. According to 2 Kings xi sq., Jehoiada must have held the reins until Jehoash reached maturity, and one can only form conjectures as to the relations between the reforming parties of Israel and Judah. The novel story of an apostasy from Yahweh amid the protests of priests and prophets may represent the form which tradition had taken in the chronicler's age, and it is plausible to assume that it is on a line with the treatment elsewhere of political history from a religious standpoint. To appreciate this it is only necessary to place oneself in the age of Jehu and Elisha, and to consider the significance of an act of apostasy from *their* point of view. If one attempts to understand the times of Jehu, Elisha, and Jehonadab, it is not difficult to conceive what would have been thought if Jehoash and the nobles of Judah had actually severed themselves from the reforming movement. In fact, if Jehu came to the throne as the supporter of the reformers and as king of Judah and Israel, and if, under circumstances which it would be useless to conjecture, Judah subsequently succeeded in recovering its independence under Jehoash, our knowledge of the general conditions shows that this would both explain certain features in the chronicler's tradition and would form the necessary antecedent to the defeat of Amaziah and the vengeance taken upon Jerusalem.

Some hypothesis of this kind seems to be demanded by the traditions viewed as a whole. The Judaean compilers clearly hold that the kingdom of Judah was recovered for the family of David, and it is inevitable that historical inquiry should attempt to ascertain more precisely the probable events of the age. Now, in considering the evidence which conflicts with this hypothesis, it is impossible to overlook sundry phenomena in the Judaean narrative, 2 Kings xi–xii. The overthrow of Athaliah is followed by the accession of Jehoash and his temple-reforms. But the ruined condition of the temple in his twenty-third year (xii. 6) can hardly be ascribed to the

mysterious disasters which befell the city in Jehoram's reign, an event for which the chronicler is our authority; nor is it probable that it is due to the misdeeds of Athaliah as this writer believes (xxiv. 7). The infant prince had been secreted in the sacred precincts (1 Kings xi. 3), and for some years at least the high-priest Jehoiada was practically at the head of affairs. Moreover, the history of Judah does not lead to the expectation that there would be Carites among the temple-guard in the ninth century (xi. 19). But these narratives, in common with xvi. 10–18 and xxii. 3–xxiii. 24, have been assigned to a series of temple-narratives[1], and although to postulate a *continuous* "history of the temple" may be (with Skinner) too narrow a conception of the writer's standpoint, "attention is focussed, not on the king and the fortunes of the kingdom, but upon the temple and its ritual" (Kent). It is also to be observed that in some cases the citations form part of the Judaean annals themselves, that of the 480 years from the foundation of the temple to the Return from Exile the reform of Jehoash marks the end of the first third, and that there is reason to believe that we owe the Judaean chronology to the hand which introduced the temple-notices[2].

There is a close literary relation between the account of the repairs in xii. 11–16 and those in the time of Josiah (xxii. 3–7); points of resemblance in the history of these kings can also be found. Both come to the throne after a revolt, and in each case their tender years imply a regency, of which, however, there is no hint in the life of Josiah. The condition of the temple is perhaps more intelligible in the later age, the allusion to Carites is more natural in the seventh century, and, if Athaliah's name is of Assyrian origin, its occurrence after the time of Manasseh is perhaps more probable[3]. It is now very generally agreed that xxii sq. have been revised, though to what extent is disputed. The account of Josiah's interest in the repair of the temple is entirely superseded by the discovery of the law-book, and the buildings ("which the kings of Judah had destroyed," 2 Chron. xxxiv. 11) are ignored in the description of the great reform which constitutes the climax of the book of Kings. But such repairs now enter into the history of Jehoash in an incident which is scarcely creditable to the priests: it was in the eighteenth year (of Josiah) that instructions

[1] Wellhausen; cp. Benzinger, p. 159; Robertson Smith and Kautzsch, *Ency. Bib.*, col. 2671; Kent, p. 17.

[2] See for the latter, W. R. Smith, op. cit., p. 147 sq., and cp. *J. Q. R.*, XX, pp. 159, 161.

[3] Athaliah: "Yahweh is exalted" (so Cheyne, who compares Ass. *etellu*).

were given to attend to the needs of the temple-structure (xxii. 3), but in the twenty-third year (of Jehoash), it was found that the priests had not repaired the breaches of the house, and Jehoiada and his colleagues were taken to task for their negligence. Cases can be adduced where historical material was freely used for specific purposes, often with only slight and superficial adjustment, and even in 1 Kings xv. 15 a compiler has inserted an obscure allusion to the temple-vessels which is only intelligible when the verse is considered in its suitable context in vii. 51. Here it is possible that the writer intended to illustrate Asa's piety from his temple-source without any careful regard to sense or connexion, and this view may be supported by the reference to David's weapons in 2 Kings xi. 10, 2 Chron. xxiii. 9, which overlooks the previous notice in 1 Kings xiv. 26 sq. It must be admitted, however, that the data are too inconclusive for any positive decision, but the possibility still remains that the account of the rise of Jehoash (in so far as the situations conflict with the trend of history) has been influenced by that of the young Josiah, where the account of the temple has now been almost superseded by a description of his epoch-making reforms[1].

In Jehu's reign "Yahweh began to cut Israel short," and Hazael made his attacks upon the land. The Judaean annals relate that Gath was taken and that Jerusalem escaped by offering a timely bribe (xii. 17 sq.). It is true that the Syrians reached Aphek, presumably on the road to Philistia, but the first onslaughts were delivered east of the Jordan (x. 33), and it is conceivable that Judah was not threatened in the early stages of the war. The reference to Gath raises the question of Philistia, and Ewald conjectured that it had been conquered by Judah and had appealed to Damascus for aid. In 2 Kings xiii. 22 Lucian's recension records the tradition that Hazael had taken the Philistine out of the hand of Jehoahaz, from the Western Sea unto Aphek. This independently points to the later date for the invasion of Judaean territory, and it is interesting to notice that xii. 17 sq. and xiii. 22 (Lucian) represent events from the Judaean and Israelite standpoints respectively. The Judaean version is chiefly interested in the temple (so also in the notice of Shishak's invasion, 1 Kings xiv. 25 sqq.), and, as already observed, 2 Chron. xxiv. 23 sqq. follow a different tradition, associating the attack with some apostasy after the death of Jehoiada. Here it is stated that a small Aramaean army destroyed the Judaean host and sent all the

[1] Apart from the suggestion in *J. Q. R.*, XX, 163, n. 1, it may be added that E. Day, *Journ. Bibl. Lit.*, 1902, p. 203, lays stress on the close connexion between the history of Josiah and that of Jehoiada; cp. also W. Erbt, *Orient. Lit. Zeit.*, 1908, Feb., col. 59 sqq.

spoil to the king of Damascus, and there is no allusion to the use which was made of the temple and royal treasure. Naturally, if the Syrian army had been under the command of Hazael of Gath, he, as king of Damascus, would have taken the spoil for himself; and the notice finds a more intelligible explanation in the conjecture that Syrian mercenaries had been hired and that the booty was the payment for their services.

Our survey of the history from Ahab to Jehu has led to the conclusion that the traditions are at variance in regard to the Aramaean wars, and that the evidence tends to the view that they did not commence before the dynasty of Jehu. Further, the traditions point to the independence of Judah under Jehoash and Amaziah *after* the practical union of Judah and Israel under the Omri dynasty and *before* the vengeance taken by Israel upon Amaziah. It was inferred that Jehu would at least lay claim to sovereignty over Judah, and although some narratives imply that the government of Judah for some years actually lay in the hands of the priests (Jehoiada), a singular story suggests that there was a combined effort by Jehoash and the Judaean nobles to break away from the priestly party (i. e. from those who had promoted religious reforms parallel to those in Israel). The main object of these notes being to indicate the problems and not to attempt to settle the numerous questions which are inevitably raised, it is perhaps enough to observe that historical criticism will scarcely be able to recover the true history of the period save in its broadest outlines. Had there been the break in Judaean history which our conclusions suggest, it is only natural that the national records should have attempted to bridge it, and it is instructive to find at a later period, where another interruption may be inferred, clear traces in the chronological systems of earlier and later conceptions of the relations between Judah and Israel[1].

IV. *The History of the Period.*

The fact that Jehoram and Ahaziah are kings both of Judah and (in the inverse order) of Israel in the few years separating the two pairs Jehoshaphat and Ahab from Jehoash and Jehu may illustrate the intimate relationship between the two reigning families, but it is a coincidence that, while Israelite history records the

[1] The situation at Amaziah's defeat hardly allows the independence of Judah, and the chronological notices imply that his successor Uzziah began to reign in the third year of Jeroboam (xv. 8) or in the twenty-seventh (xv. 1), although others allow that Amaziah "lived" fifteen years after the fateful battle (xiv. 17, cp. xiii. 10 with xiv. 2).

sickness of Ahaziah and Elijah's prediction (2 Kings i), the chronicler has the story of a message from Elijah to Jehoram of Judah announcing his impending death from a frightful disease (2 Chron. xxi. 11–15). It is true that Elisha has already taken the place of Elijah in the account of Jehoshaphat and Israel (2 Kings iii. 11); but this does not explain the story, and one is obliged to recognize that the chronicler had access to some very interesting material. The recognition of this, however, is to be kept distinct in the first instance from any inquiry into its true historical value. Further, the account of Jehoshaphat's wars in Chronicles is undoubtedly extravagant, but even 1 Kings xxii. 47 implies the conquest of Edom, and this scanty notice, when estimated in the light of known conditions in the south of Palestine, clearly brings with it much indirect information. Again, the brief references to the rebellion of Libnah (in the Philistine country) and of Edom against Jehoram (2 Kings viii. 20–22) may very properly be regarded as the merest abstract of data which reappear in a late and exaggerated dress in the chronicler's story of the Philistines, Arabians, and Cushites (2 Chron. xxi. 16). Yet another example is afforded by a comparison of Uzziah's recovery of Elath in 2 Kings xiv. 22 with his successes over Philistines, Arabians, and Meunim (2 Chron. xxvi. 7). Concerted action between Philistia and Edom (with the allied districts) is entirely intelligible, as is clear from the history of Ahaz and Hezekiah, and it is not improbable that the use of the term "Arabians" in Chronicles is due to the circumstances of the post-exilic age when the Edomites no longer held their earlier seats.

Now, since the relations between Judah and Israel under Ahab scarcely changed when this king was succeeded by his son Ahaziah, the chronicler's account of the destruction of Jehoshaphat's fleet (2 Chron. xx. 35–37) is probably correct in representing the two kings as partners from the first[1], and 1 Kings xxii. 47–50 puts the incident in a rather different light with the apparent object of obscuring an alliance which was not considered creditable. When, moreover, the chronicler proceeds to give the warning of the prophet Eliezer, the son of Dodovahu of Mareshah (xx. 37), there is no reason to doubt that some older source has been used, since we know that Libnah and Edom subsequently revolted against Jehoshaphat's son, and not only was Mareshah near the scene of trouble, but the name of the seer's father has quite an old stamp[2]. One may surely conclude in this

[1] See Skinner, p. 270. The chronicler's passage is famous for the misinterpretation of the Tarshish ships.

[2] G. B. Gray, *Hebrew Proper Names*, p. 232.

case at least that the novel traditions of the book of Chronicles rest upon sources the essential elements of which are closely akin to the now abbreviated notes in Kings. The historical value of these sources does not, however, belong to an inquiry which aims at collecting and sifting all accessible material.

At this stage, the Moabite campaign deserves notice. According to 2 Kings iii, Jehoram of Israel was in alliance with Jehoshaphat; the chronological scheme in Lucian's recension, however, is obliged to substitute Ahaziah, and the statement in 2 Kings i. 17 shows decisively that the Israelite Jehoram had come to the throne in the second year of his Judaean namesake. Nevertheless, there can be little doubt that one of the objects of the *present* narrative is to contrast the good king Jehoshaphat with the Baal-worshipper of the house of Ahab (iii. 13 sq., contrast ver. 2). There are literary points of contact with the narratives of Ahab and Jehoshaphat, and it seems probable that a purely political narrative has been used in order to illustrate the influence of the prophet Elisha[1]. The last-mentioned is discovered in the camp, or in the desert-region south of the Dead Sea; he is summoned to save an army from dying miserably of thirst, and this becomes a fresh wonder when the Moabites believe that the allies had fallen upon one another[2]. Part of the narrative describes the manner in which the army was wont to devastate Moabite territory (the tenses in ver. 25 are frequentative), but it hastens to describe a single occurrence at Kir-hareseth, and concludes abruptly with a reference to some Israelite disaster. When these points are taken into consideration with the appearance of Elisha (well known to Jehoshaphat as a true prophet, ver. 12), it seems highly probable that the whole account is the result of careful re-writing or revision. Consequently, the allusions to the *king* of Edom as an ally of Israel and Judah do not belong necessarily to the original narrative. Edom had been subject to Jehoshaphat (1 Kings xxii. 47 sq.); it had revolted under Jehoram of Judah when it "made a king" for itself (2 Kings viii. 20), and it was subsequently re-conquered by Amaziah. The natural assumption would be that Edom was now either a dependent vassal—and without a king—or hostile, and support for the latter may be claimed in the attempt of the king of Moab to cut his way through to the king of Edom—not with the object of taking vengeance for a supposed act of unfaithfulness,

[1] Cp. verses 7, 11 with 1 Kings xxii. 4-7; ver. 14 with xvii. 1; ver. 20 with xviii. 29, 36.

[2] If a natural explanation of the incidents can be found the writer of the narrative was ignorant of it, and to rationalize the details is to obscure the story as it appealed to its readers.

but simply in order to join forces with his ally[1]. Mesha's inscription shows that Omri must have forced Moab southwards, i.e. towards Edom, and its attempt to recover its independence would certainly involve some agreement with Edom. It may be assumed, therefore, that Jehoram's march round by the south end of the Dead Sea was intended to drive a wedge between the two states, and from the account of the withdrawal of the army it appears that the expedition failed[2]. Thus there is some ground for the view that underlying 2 Kings iii is a tradition of the defeat of Jehoram of Israel at the hands of Moab—and probably Edom—and in this neither Elisha nor Jehoshaphat originally found a place. It is more important, however, to observe that if Israelite tradition has recorded an unsuccessful expedition by Jehoram along the southern side of the Dead Sea against Moab—and probably Edom, the independent annals of the Judaean Jehoram, with their brief allusion to the revolt of Libnah and of Edom, make no reference to Israel—whose aid would surely have been enlisted—but mention some obscure defeat by Edom at the otherwise unknown Zair (צָעִיר). Various conjectures have been made, but one can hardly find a better one than that of Ewald, viz. Zoar (צֹעַר) at the extreme south end of the Dead Sea[3]. The result is suggestive—and embarrassing, and it is necessary to bear in mind that in dealing with independent records, the presence of independent standpoints must be allowed. From the Judaean annals alone it is tempting to associate the disaster to Jehoshaphat's fleet at Ezion-geber (1 Kings xxii. 48) with the great revolt in the time of Jehoram of Judah, but the loss affected both Jehoshaphat and Ahaziah (2 Chron. xx. 35-37), and it is Ahaziah's son Jehoram of Israel who suffers from Moab—and Edom. Had there been one king over a united Judah and Israel, it is possible to understand how the coincidences in the history of this period could have arisen in the attempt to narrate events from separate standpoints. There seems to have been a body of tradition upon which the historians could draw, and this they apparently utilized at a time when no very clear recollection of the events was retained.

These wars of the period between Ahab and Jehu, when the peoples of South Palestine and Moab were up in arms, may be

[1] To a certain extent this interpretation of 2 Kings iii. 26 is held by Kittel, *Kings*, pp. 193, 196; see also Küchler, *Stellung des Propheten Jesaja*, p. 6.

[2] For joint action by Moab, Edom, &c., cp. 2 Chron. xx. 10, 22. Some hostile relations between the two appear to be indicated in Amos ii. 1, but naturally the relations would vary from age to age.

[3] An equally simple emendation is required in Jer. xlviii. 4 (end).

supplemented by the story of the remarkable successes ascribed to Jehoshaphat in 2 Chron. xx, and by the chronicler's history of the Judaean Jehoram (xxi–xxii. 1). On ascending the throne the latter slew his brethren and many nobles, and was denounced by Elijah; the Philistines, Arabians, &c., invaded Judah, looted the palace, carried off his wives and sons, and left only the youngest Jehoahaz (Ahaziah). This tradition is incorporated by the chronicler together with the familiar notice of Edom and Libnah, and must, like the latter, be taken from some older source. In spite of its late dress some of the elements are entirely plausible, and although the picture differs from that which we gain from the book of Kings, even the latter contains features which are found to present the most serious difficulties. It is another picture of revolt in South Palestine; and the scenes of bloodshed at the accession of Jehoram cannot fail to recall the rise of Jehu who, by the way, is twice called the son of Jehoshaphat (2 Kings ix. 2, 14), and, as Ahab's captain, may well have been of the royal blood (cp. Abner).

The view that Judah was the vassal of Israel, in the latter part of Omri's dynasty at least, is too well known to call for comment, but, although we may probably infer that it recovered its independence under Jehoash, it is impossible to work back with any security through the preceding years. How Judah came to lose its independence can scarcely be guessed, and if certain data suggest that Judah and Israel had been under one king, there is no evidence to determine how or when this situation arose. Even the earlier Judaean traditions elude inquiry. Both Baasha and Omri gained their position when the Israelite army was laying siege to the Philistines at Gibbethon (1 Kings xv. 27, xvi. 15), an unidentified place mentioned with Eltekeh, Aijalon, &c., in the southern territory of Dan (Joshua xix. 40–46). These isolated facts cannot be isolated in any inquiry, and the conflicts separated by some five-and-twenty years must have both cause and effect. Fuller narratives of such disputes would tempt us to ask the position of Judah, but Judah is ignored and the Judaean narratives are unaware of the crises. On the other hand, both Israelite and Judaean annals record war between Asa and Baasha "all their days" (1 Kings xv. 16, 32), and an interesting incident is related. Asa, it seems, was hard pressed by Baasha, and could only gain relief by sending to Ben-hadad and begging him to break his alliance with Israel. An army was at once dispatched against the northern territory, and Baasha was compelled to retire (xv. 17–22). The incident is practically a torso. The compiler of Kings had already described the foundation of the kingdom of Damascus and Edom's recovery

of its old position. Both are represented as constantly inimical to Solomon (xi. 25, cp. ver. 22 LXX), and consequently the allusion to the alliance between the fathers of Asa and Ben-hadad point to some significant changes during the twenty years of Rehoboam and Abijam. Further, if Damascus was bribed to break off its alliance with Israel, this, too, is important for subsequent history, and modern writers who condemn Asa's policy have seen in it the foundation of future troubles. Ultimately, however, Israel and Judah are represented as united against Damascus, and in Ahab's time we are suddenly plunged into the midst of the siege of Samaria. It is obvious that this fragment of Asa's history supplies food for conjecture, but there is no independent evidence by which to test it, and its value for us lies primarily in its bearing upon the Aramaean wars.

The endeavour has been made in the course of these notes to trace the wars between Israel and Damascus, and reasons have been given for the view that they began *after* 842. Also, upon independent grounds, from a survey of the relations between Judah and Israel, it has been inferred that there was a separation between the two after the downfall of the Omri dynasty and before Joash's great defeat of Amaziah. Certain traditions point to a conspiracy of the Judaean nobles and Jehoash and to the invasion of Judah by Aramaean troops. The account of Asa and Baasha may possibly serve to suggest the course of events. If Jehoash actually followed the policy ascribed to Asa, and used the royal treasure to win over the help of Damascus, a new light is thrown upon the outbreak of war between Israel and the Aramaeans. Even the statement that Jehoash lost his life in a conspiracy thus becomes more natural (in view of the former relations between the two kingdoms) than on the ordinary assumption that he owed his unpopularity to the price he paid for delivering his land from Hazael. It is intelligible that the profound events during the latter half of the ninth century should have made a great impression, and that diverging traditions should have been current; it is natural, too, that, had the history of Judah taken the course which we have suggested, later compilers may have found traditions more favourable to their national patriotism. This conjecture of the origin of the Aramaean wars can only be made in all diffidence, but it is at least a coincidence that the presumed results of Asa's appeal to Damascus agree closely with the events in Jehu's dynasty which are without an antecedent.

V. *Conclusion.*

In these notes we have attempted to investigate the history of an age where there seemed to be sufficient evidence for some preliminary conclusions; it now remains to summarize briefly a few of the more important features. The few years from the decline of Ahab to the rise of Jehu extend over about one-third of the entire book of Kings—the history of Solomon about another third—and we have the additional advantage of possessing an extremely valuable external source. The last-mentioned has brought out one very noteworthy feature: the silence of the biblical traditions in regard to Assyria. The interest of our authors is national, perhaps rather local; their horizon was circumscribed, they disregarded or perhaps were even unacquainted with the great movements which Assyriological research has revealed. We may contrast them with those prophets whose oracles evince a keen interest in all that went on in the lands around Palestine; and consequently we may avoid the tendency to read our traditions too closely in the light of our fuller knowledge of events. Historians would no doubt allow that events in Palestine during our period were directly or indirectly shaped by the threatening attitude of Assyria, but we cannot recover these from the biblical traditions which give their own representation of the history; and any attempt to dress them in accordance with the cuneiform evidence would be as unsound as to find a scientific evolution theory in the account of the Creation. We desire therefore to avoid all promiscuous combinations of evidence from totally distinct quarters, and this is precisely the method which should be adopted whenever native tradition and external or archaeological evidence have to be brought into connexion. History clothes itself in many ways, and the events which seem most striking to us often fail to leave their mark upon popular tradition. Here, in our period it is not history, in the modern sense of the word, but the work of the prophets, which our writers have at heart; it is not the historian who would embody the quiet domestic stories of Elisha, but those whose interest lay in the prophetical communities; genuine historical traditions have undoubtedly been employed, but it is necessary for criticism to attempt to unravel the threads before the course of history can be safely recovered, and only when some progress has been made in this can the work of literary criticism—the study of the literary growth of the traditions—expect to pass beyond the present initial stages. It is naturally necessary to adjust the results of literary criticism to a historical framework, and for this the study of the four centuries from the time of David to the fall of Jerusalem

is of the first importance. The earlier periods have been dealt with provisionally by the present writer elsewhere; in submitting this collection of notes it must be distinctly recognized that they have intentionally been restricted to an independent survey within somewhat narrow limits.

The treatment of the Aramaean wars and of the figure of Elisha has perhaps been sufficiently noticed. The concise details of the disasters during Jehu's dynasty are apt to be overlooked from their very brevity, but it is necessary to go behind the summary details and seek to recover their significance. As a matter of fact there is much useful evidence which illustrates warfare in North Israel (Deborah and Barak, the victory of the Philistines at Ebenezer and Aphek, the overthrow of Israel at the battle of Gilboa, the wars in the Omri dynasty), and it is obvious that writers could draw at length upon the popular traditions of the district. A closer scrutiny will even suggest that there are parallels which are not accidental but are due to confusion; there are narratives admitted to be much later than the events themselves which contain elements which reappear later in records of subsequent ages in a more historical environment (cp. p. 610, n. 1). This is a feature which it is unnecessary to pursue further at this stage, and any one can picture for himself the significance for the Israelites of the brief data preserved in 2 Kings x. 32 sq., xiii. 3–7, 14–19, 22–25, xiv. 25–27.

The internal history of the period at the rise of Jehu has been obscured, and the Judaean traditions which reach us in two forms (Kings and Chronicles) are too closely occupied with the fortunes of the Davidic dynasty and the temple to furnish us with a representation of the great events in which Judah was vitally concerned. From the Israelite point of view the subject is the fall of one dynasty and the rise of its successor, a change of national importance to which a religious significance was attached even when religious changes were not involved. Jehu, a military commander like Abner or Zimri, comes forward as the champion of Yahweh to end the old age and to inaugurate the new. The founder of the previous dynasty had been confronted with a rival, and civil war prevailed until Omri made good his position. Baasha had killed his predecessor at Gibbethon, and the ill-fated Abner had commenced to intrigue with Judah. That there were grave disturbances before Jehu's accession could already be inferred from the account of the Aramaean war beyond the Jordan, but it is equally necessary to take into consideration the traditions of the serious troubles in which Edom, Moab, and Philistia were concerned.

Although Elisha sent to anoint Jehu the son of Jehoshaphat

(2 Kings ix. 2), he took no part in the reforms. To him is ascribed the inauguration of a new religious era which colours the narratives as a whole, but it is Jehonadab the Rechabite who suddenly leaps into prominence, and as suddenly disappears. Phenomena of this character sometimes have a purely literary explanation; more could probably have been told of the part he took had subsequent writers cared to describe more fully the early years of the dynasty of Jehu. The sect which is thus associated with Jehu's zeal was one which inculcated nomadic simplicity and is connected with the Kenites. Elsewhere Israelite tradition knew of friendly relations between its kings and the clans of the south; Saul shows his friendship for the Kenites (1 Sam. xv. 6), and it is possible that Samuel was of southern origin before later local tradition magnified his position[1]. At all events, we cannot treat Jehonadab as an isolated fact. In the announcement to Elijah at Horeb of the advent of the sword, in the seven thousand faithful adherents of Yahweh and in the sudden prominence of the Rechabite-Kenite sect, there are the traces of a tradition which has hardly left sufficiently definite indications for its recovery; but it is a tradition which cannot be lightly put on one side in view of the criticism of the period. Subsequently we know that the bloodshed of Jezreel was bitterly resented (Hos. i. 4), and this later change in attitude can scarcely be severed either from the subordination of traditions which belong to the clans of the south and appear to represent some distinctive movement, or from the scattered evidence which ascribes to them deeds of violence which it was not easy to exculpate[2]. There are obscure references to the bloodthirsty zeal of another Israelite king (Saul, 2 Sam. xxi. 2), and in view of the unambiguous testimony of Hos. i. 4, it is not surprising that the present history lays more stress upon the wickedness of Omri's dynasty and the judgment which befell it, than upon a new movement which affected both Israel and Judah.

The fall of Omri's dynasty was the penalty for its iniquity: Ahab sinned and repented, and the judgment came in his son's days when Jehoram and Jezebel met their end at Jezreel in accordance with the oracle of Yahweh (2 Kings ix. 25 sq.); but the remission of the penalty is ignored when Ahab's fate at Samaria was the fulfilment of the divine condemnation (1 Kings xxii. 38). The fluctuation of tradition between Jezreel and Samaria is by no means confined to the story of Naboth; it crops out in the account of Jehu's massacres, and it is

[1] *Critical Notes*, pp. 52, 98, note 3, 135, note 1.

[2] See, for the former, *Critical Notes*, p. 82 and n. 1, p. 122 sq., and for the latter, ibid., p. xiv, n. 1.

possible that one ought to recognize distinct local traditions emanating from Jezreel and the more southerly city of Samaria[1].

The narrative in 2 Kings ix seems, on the whole, to be the more trustworthy; it presupposes events similar to those recorded in the extant records of Elijah, but not those accounts themselves[2]. One may probably infer that the original prelude has been replaced by the present history of the life-work of Elijah. This prophet is not named in 2 Kings ix. 25 sq., but he enters into the Samarian version of Naboth's vineyard, and it is perhaps important to notice that the stories of Elijah and Elisha do not encircle Jezreel, but Samaria and Gilgal[3]. Of the Elisha narratives, those which bear upon the Aramaean wars suggest Samaria as their centre, and they clearly embody more historical data than those where the prophet lives among the prophetical communities. It is useful, therefore, to notice Prof. Kent's suggestion that Gilgal inherited the traditions of a more northerly sanctuary, and it is tempting to conjecture that the Jezreelite traditions (which geographically belong to the north of Samaria) are among the oldest which have been preserved[4].

It is easy to understand how the same elements of tradition should attach themselves indifferently to the great figures of antiquity, while the varying forms in which the same figure will appear are due to diverging traditions for which chronological or even merely local causes will suffice. In view of the past results of literary criticism this feature is of very great importance for biblical criticism, and it offers an explanation of the phenomena which so frequently perplex the biblical student. Now, it is especially in the quiet domestic stories of Elisha that parallels with the work of Elijah can be found, and where Elijah is associated with the prophetical guilds it has been recognized that the source in question is relatively late (2 Kings ii). In like manner, when Samuel appears in 1 Sam. xix. 18–24 at the head of a school of the prophets, it is commonly admitted that the passage is one of the later portions of the books of Samuel. It would seem from this, therefore, that the influence of these communities in the growth of the biblical history is of some

[1] Hosea (l. c.) refers only to Jezreel, but see 2 Kings x. 1, 7, 11, 14, 17, 25 (cp. above, pp. 604, 610 sq., 612). The unravelling of this fluctuation is perhaps the most important problem in the literary history of the period.

[2] Cp. W. R. Smith, *Ency. Bib.*, col. 2670, head.

[3] Even the exception in 2 Kings ix. 36 gives a fuller form of Elijah's denunciation of Jezebel than 1 Kings xxi. 23; but the literary history of the latter is extremely intricate (see the Commentaries).

[4] C. F. Kent, *Israel's Historical and Biographical Narratives*, p. 227 (note on § 81).

significance, and it should not be overlooked that the proximity of certain of their seats to Judaean territory would give them a greater interest in Judaean history. A distinct friendliness for Judah has already been observed in the present revised form of 2 Kings iii (see p. 621).

There is a general resemblance between the treatment of our period and that of the history in 1 Samuel. Similar features meet us in both, and there is some ground for the belief that both at one stage passed through the same circles. The books of Samuel and Kings are obviously closely connected, and at a certain period were evidently part of the great Deuteronomic history introduced by the book of Deuteronomy itself. One is aware that there is a predilection for simple literary hypotheses, but if the present notes have any value, it is clear that the literary structure is excessively intricate. The incorporation of groups of tradition representing differing standpoints can of course be due to a single compiler who has drawn upon all accessible material, but it may also arise from the literary vicissitudes of a work in the course of transmission from one centre to another. It was already obvious from the structure of the book of Kings that a certain amount of North Israelite material was taken over into Judah and now appears in a Judaean dress; and this actual transmission with successive stages of revision, suppression or omission, and the incorporation of local tradition frequently suggests itself as an explanation of some of the more complex phenomena in Old Testament research[1].

In conclusion, this endeavour to direct attention to some fundamental problems upon which the criticism of the period depends, may have succeeded in showing the general character of our sources for the history of the ninth century, B. C. In the centuries which follow, the external and internal evidence again affords adequate material for independent investigation, and we enter upon an age of turmoil and revolution, tribal movements and changes of population. These are vicissitudes whose influence upon existing religious and sociological conditions is only to be expected. Both biblical criticism and Palestinian archaeology agree that Israel did not come into forcible possession of "the great and goodly cities", and that no "hornet" drove out the earlier inhabitants. But it is in this later age that those representations of the Israelite conquest which appear to be unhistorical were taking shape. It will be legitimate to suppose that the new peoples who settled in Palestine underwent the experiences which we associate with the invading

[1] See *J. Q. R.*, XX, 157 sq., 164 sq.

Israelites, and that the occupation of another soil involved the acquisition—however partial—of its old traditions, &c. In this later age we reach a significant turning-point in the Deuteronomic spirit and in the Deuteronomic history itself: we look back upon the history of the dim past, the records of which we have attempted to survey, and we stand at the inauguration of an era which amid internal dissension and conflict leads down to the rivalry of Judaism and Samaritanism.

STANLEY A. COOK.